



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

relation of Adams to the Monroe Doctrine. Many of the important despatches are printed in full or in part in *American State Papers*.

The reviewer has found only one serious error. The foot-note on page 259 would seem to be misplaced. Did the impeccable Adams, formerly Boylston Professor of Rhetoric in Harvard College, really write twice "You was" (pages 187 and 256)? Or has the editor, nodding, allowed two typographical errors to escape his vigilant eyes?

A. J.

A History of the National Capital from its Foundation through the Period of the Adoption of the Organic Act. By WILHELMUS BOGART BRYAN. Volume II., 1815-1878. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916. Pp. xvi, 707.)

THE second volume of Mr. Bryan's history of the District of Columbia is better than the first volume. The author seems to feel more certain of his ground and to have greater familiarity with his facts. The volume itself grows better as it proceeds and the chapter next to the last, in which Mr. Bryan deals with the Shepherd régime, is the most interesting. The whole book, however, is interesting. It is not arranged on the topical plan, as histories of cities usually are, but, in a general way, proceeds chronologically. Thus the variety of the subjects dealt with holds the attention of the average reader who would grow weary with the strain of following one subject for a long time. The book shows conscientious industry and contains a wealth of facts, large and small. Presidential inaugurations, schools, municipal government, streets, roads, newspapers, clubs, slavery, bridges—these are a few of the hundreds of subjects dealt with. Many of them are of little concern to people who do not live in Washington, but many are of national importance and are a part of the history of the United States.

The federal capital, before the government of the United States created the city of Washington, had been located in two old, well-established cities which had acted as the government's hosts, and the government had no sense of ownership in New York and Philadelphia and no responsibility for their municipal affairs. When it moved to Washington it did not accept the new relationship which actually existed between itself and its city. Moreover, the theory of local self-government obtruded itself upon the fact that here there was no local population—that everybody in the city had come there to serve the government directly or indirectly. As the city formed it was encouraged to believe that it had interests independent of the government and even in conflict with it. The history of Washington, as Mr. Bryan unfolds it, is the story of how the city blundered forward oppressed and hindered in its progress by a division of responsibility when the responsibility really belonged with the federal government alone. But Congress created the separate municipality, which, until recently, had mayors, aldermen, councilmen, frequent elections, mobs, riots, bribery, debts, and all the famil-

iar attributes of cities. And as long as it had to govern itself it had civic pride, although there was not much to be proud of. The vain effort to draw a line of division between the interests of the city and of the United States went on. Congress was for a long time a hard step-mother to its own offspring. Many members could not forgive it for having been hatched upon the banks of the Potomac and it was not until our own day that efforts to move the capital to some other place were finally abandoned.

Mr. Bryan tells us how the city in 1817 entered upon a plan of canal construction, joining with other communities in the pursuit of wealth through internal improvements; but in 1828 the railroads began to come and the canals never brought in any profit. The city was bankrupt in 1836. It had borrowed much of the money for the canals from bankers in Amsterdam. Consequently, it was declared on the floor of the Senate: "the agents of the foreign creditors are here ready to purchase the property of these citizens of Washington under the hammer, so that there is danger emphatically that this city may be sold to the Dutch." "It was said", adds Mr. Bryan, "by those members of Congress who acknowledged no right of claim to relief that they were willing to vote for it as they did not wish to see the capital sold." So Congress paid the debt for Washington, but not for Georgetown and Alexandria.

The national capital then comprised the three cities of Georgetown, Alexandria, and Washington, but so unprofitable did the connection appear to be to Georgetown and Alexandria that they desired to sever it and to return to their original allegiance. In 1838 the citizens of Georgetown at a public meeting said that Congress did not afford the city congenial and proper legislation and they sent a memorial to the Maryland legislature asking the state to take Georgetown back. A committee of the legislature reported favorably on the request, but the state was already burdened with canal debts and did not wish to bring Georgetown in with more, so it laid the Georgetown memorial on the table. Alexandria, however, when it found its burdens heavy, found promise of help in the legislature of Virginia, and when it requested to be put again under Virginia jurisdiction the act on Virginia's part was promptly passed. The measure was looked upon with equal favor by the national Congress, but that body made it conditional upon an expression of preference on the part of the inhabitants of Alexandria and the vicinity. They left no doubt on the point by voting 7463 in favor of the change and 222 against it. From that time (1846) the history of the national capital excludes Alexandria.

The grievance of the District against Congress was not only that it neglected it but that it experimented upon it. The chairman of the House committee on the District is quoted by Mr. Bryan as saying: "Some gentlemen seem to regard the District of Columbia with the same feelings with which doctors regard animal life. They look upon it as a rat under an exhausted receiver, where political empirics may display

their quackery without danger of being called to account for their folly and ignorance."

The inclination to make the city a proving-ground had a good illustration as soon as the Civil War was over, when the question of negro suffrage was brought forward. It was pronounced against in Washington by 6591 votes to 35 and in Georgetown by 712 votes to one vote. Nevertheless, Congress determined to try it here first and the negroes were given the ballot. When they first voted in 1867 they were orderly and the candidates were white men. After a time, however, they demanded and received a share of the municipal offices. An effort was made at this time to further experiment with the city by allowing women to vote, and Representative Julian of Indiana offered an amendment to the District government bill for that purpose, but Congress was opposed to it. So far as negro suffrage was concerned, although it was obnoxious to the white people in the District, as Mr. Bryan says, it never fulfilled the worst predictions of its opponents. It gave the city an inferior set of officials, but it did not put the city wholly at the mercy of the less intelligent and responsible residents. It had a tendency, however, to lower the tone of the government and to strengthen the hold of national questions upon purely local problems. The effort of the more far-seeing citizens was to divorce the city from consideration of national politics. They pointed out truly enough that as it must have the good-will of Congress it was bad policy to offend the political views of the members. When the political excitement was intense immediately after Lincoln's election it was seriously proposed by responsible property-holders that the entire management of the city should be put in the hands of Congress.

A new form of government was given the city in 1871 with the power still partially in the hands of the citizens. There was a board of public works, however, appointed by the President, and Alexander R. Shepherd became in fact the board of public works. Then began that extraordinary régime, under which money was borrowed without collateral, all questions which required public approval were carried by rough but effective methods, new streets were opened, hills were levelled, pavements were laid, and the noble plan of L'Enfant which had been a forgotten dream was made a reality. By the time that sober citizens had caught up with the breakneck race of the mad builder of Washington and headed him off his work was done. The credit of the city was gone, debt was piled on debt, it was impossible for the city to pay the interest under any arrangement. The value of much of the property had been destroyed by regrading the streets, curses loud and deep fell upon the head of the ruthless Cadmus, but Washington was made. Between the drawing of the plans by the visionary, impracticable, contentious L'Enfant and the building of the city by the reckless, determined, unscrupulous Shepherd, eighty years of doubtful and precarious destiny had passed.

With the downfall of Shepherd ended local self-government in the District of Columbia, and in 1874 began the commission form of government with all the chief appointments resting in the President and the population not voting. Mr. Bryan's history stops at this point, but it is evident that he has a great deal more to say and a third volume bringing the history up to the present day is to be hoped for.

GAILLARD HUNT.

Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy 1815-1915. By MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Goucher College. (Washington: American Historical Association; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916. Pp. ix, 392.)

THE excellence of the work done in this volume is attested by the fact that the Justin Winsor Prize in American History for 1914 was awarded to the author on account of it. It is indeed the most important exposition, historically speaking, of the subject to which it relates. For the first time, by reason of the use of manuscripts in the Public Record Office in London and the Department of State at Washington, but particularly of those in London, the actual course of the negotiation of the celebrated Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is disclosed. In one place (p. 102) the author speaks of Clayton as having been guilty of "indirection", and elsewhere represents him as having shown a want of what we may call steadiness in the conduct of the transaction. It is not implied, however, that he overreached his adversaries in the negotiations. All the proofs combine to show how ardent was his desire to make a treaty which should on the one hand be approved by the United States Senate, and which should on the other hand be the means of averting a collision with Great Britain. The latter motive seems indeed to have been the overruling one, and to such an extent was it influential that it produced results in phraseology that came near defeating Clayton's main object.

This circumstance and the train of events connected with it render appropriate certain comments which by no means affect the accuracy or thoroughness of the author's investigations but relate rather to historical perspective. On a certain occasion a public speaker, when asked to give reasons for his demand for a "big navy", replied that he "desired to be in the fashion". By analogy, we may say that there seems to be a certain historical "atmosphere" which is supposed to be essential to the discussion of the diplomacy of Pierce's administration, to say nothing of that of Buchanan. A certain depreciation should, it seems, characterize it: a suspicion of aggressiveness, especially in the interest of the "slave power", should always attend it; and to this should be added, for seasoning, just a dash of assumed demagoguery. On any other supposition, how are we to explain the fact that, while the language of Pierce's message of 1855 is admitted to have been temperate, there should be found, in the "determination not to yield on either the